UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/026,630	12/27/2001	Zachary Dimenstein	108241	7728

25944 7590 08/12/2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
DEAN, RAYMOND S	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2684	2

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/026,630	DIMENSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Raymond S Dean	2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 61 and 64 - 79* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1 - 61 and 64 - 79* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *42* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *27 December 2001* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the modem port (132) in Figure 1 as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant uses the same reference number 102 for the modem and modem connector. See section 0008 lines 3 – 4 and Section 0018 line 5. The reference numbers 13, 14, 15, and 16 should be changed to 103, 104, 105, and 106 respectively in Section 0019. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 42 recites the limitation "the detachable holder" in line 1 of Claim 42. Claim 42 depends on Claim 41, which recites a "holder" and not a "detachable holder" thus there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in Claim 42.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 9, 21, 29, 59, and 67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pardo (US 6,266,539).

Regarding Claim 1, Pardo teaches a docking station for a mobile computing device, comprising: a base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 19 – 23, the telephone docking station is the base); a holder for physically and electrically connecting the mobile computing device to the base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 20 – 23, the holder is the port (16) for the personal digital assistant (PDA)); and a telephone, the telephone being capable of directly dialing a number stored in a database on the mobile computing device, when the mobile computing device is connected to the docking station (Column 6 lines 31 – 32), the telephone being capable of dialing a number through operation of the telephone keypad when the mobile computing device is not docked (Figure 3A, Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Regarding Claim 9, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo further teaches a data modem, the data modem enabling the mobile computing device to access the Internet (Column 5 lines 52 – 56).

Regarding Claim 21, Pardo teaches a docking station for a mobile computing device, the mobile computing device having a rechargeable battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28), comprising: a base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 19 – 23, the telephone docking station is the base); a holder for docking the mobile computing device in the docking station, the holder providing an electrical connection between the mobile computing device and the docking station (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 20 – 23, the holder is the port (16) for the personal digital assistant (PDA)); a charger for recharging the rechargeable

battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28); and a telephone, the telephone being capable of directly dialing a number stored in a database on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is connected to the docking station (Column 6 lines 31 – 32), the telephone being capable of dialing a number through operation of the telephone keypad when the mobile computing device is not docked (Figure 3A, Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Regarding Claim 29, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo further teaches a data modem, the data modem enabling the mobile computing device to access the Internet (Column 5 lines 52 – 56).

Regarding Claim 59, Pardo teaches a docking station for a mobile computing device having a rechargeable battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28), comprising: a base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 19 – 23, the telephone docking station is the base); a holder for physically and electrically connecting the mobile computing device to the base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 20 – 23, the holder is the port (16) for the personal digital assistant (PDA)); a charger for recharging the rechargeable battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28); a modem (Column 5 lines 52 – 56); and at least one of a phone and a fax data modem connector for connecting the docking station to a telephone wall outlet (Figure 3A, Column 5 lines 52 – 56, the docking station comprises a telephone and a modem, said docking station also uses telephone lines, which are connected to wall outlets, thus there is an inherent modem connector).

Regarding Claim 67, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo further teaches a data modem, the data modem enabling the mobile computing device to access the Internet (Column 5 lines 52 – 56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 22, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Helot (US 6,231,371).

Regarding Claim 2, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach a hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the base, wherein the holder is physically and electrically connected to the hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin.

Helot teaches a hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the base, wherein the holder is physically and electrically connected to the hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin (Column 2 lines 59 – 65, Column 5 lines 33 – 39, the cradle can be rotated such that the user can view the PDA at different angles, said cradle is electrically connected to the docking station thus there is an inherent hinge pin).

Pardo and Helot both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the hinge pin taught in Helot in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of creating an adjustable cradle that will allow a docked PDA to be viewed at an optimal angle reduce glare and to maximize contrast on the display of said PDA as taught by Helot.

Regarding Claim 22, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station.

Helot teaches wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station (Column 2 lines 59 – 65, Column 5 lines 33 – 39, the cradle can be rotated such that the user can view the PDA at different angles, said cradle is electrically connected to the docking station thus there is an inherent hinge pin).

Pardo and Helot both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the hinge pin taught in Helot in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of creating an adjustable cradle that will allow a docked PDA to be viewed at an optimal angle reduce glare and to maximize contrast on the display of said PDA as taught by Helot.

Regarding Claim 60, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station.

Helot teaches wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station (Column 2 lines 59 – 65, Column 5 lines 33 – 39, the cradle can be rotated such that the user can view the PDA at different angles, said cradle is electrically connected to the docking station thus there is an inherent hinge pin).

Pardo and Helot both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the hinge pin taught in Helot in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of creating an adjustable cradle that will allow a docked PDA to be viewed at an optimal angle reduce glare and to maximize contrast on the display of said PDA as taught by Helot.

9. Claims 3 – 5, 23 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Kennedy et al. (US 6,377,825).

Regarding Claim 3, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach wherein the holder is a detachable holder.

Kennedy teaches a holder that is a detachable holder (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 – 65, the pocket is the holder, a plurality of pockets can used with the same interface module which means that said pocket is detachable).

Pardo and Kennedy (Column 5 lines 25 – 30) both teach a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the detachable pocket taught in Kennedy in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user to use a plurality of PDA models without having to replace said docking station as taught by Kennedy.

Regarding Claim 4, Pardo in view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 3. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder is interchangeable with at least one other detachable holder for at least one other mobile computing device of a different form or type (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30).

Regarding Claim 5, Pardo in view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 4. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder and the at least one other detachable holder includes an outside portion and an inside portion (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 - 65, the outside portion of the pocket connects to the interface module (106)), the outside portion providing an electrical connection to an electrical interface (Column 6 lines 11 – 19), the inside portion providing an electrical connection to a unique electrical interface of the mobile computing device and at least one other mobile computing device, respectively (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30, Column 6 lines 1 – 5).

Regarding Claim 23, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach wherein the holder is a detachable holder.

Kennedy teaches a holder that is a detachable holder (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 – 65, the pocket is the holder, a plurality of pockets can used with the same interface module which means that said pocket is detachable).

Pardo and Kennedy (Column 5 lines 25 – 30) both teach a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the detachable pocket taught in Kennedy in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user to use a plurality of PDA models without having to replace said docking station as taught by Kennedy.

Regarding Claim 24, Pardo in view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 23. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder is interchangeable with at least one other detachable holder for at least one other mobile computing device of a different form or type (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30).

Regarding Claim 25, Pardo in view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 24. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder and the at least one other detachable holder includes an outside portion and an inside portion (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 - 65, the outside portion of the pocket connects to the interface module (106)), the outside portion providing an electrical connection to an electrical interface (Column 6 lines 11 – 19), the inside portion providing an electrical connection to a unique electrical interface of the mobile computing device and at least

one other mobile computing device, respectively (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30, Column 6 lines 1 – 5).

10. Claims 6, 8, 10 – 11, 15, 17 – 20, 26, 28, 30 – 31, 35, 37 – 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495).

Regarding Claim 6, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach a printer for printing data stored on at least one of the mobile computing device and the docking station.

Yeh teaches a printer for printing data stored on at least one of the mobile computing device and the docking station (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 8, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device.

Yeh teaches at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39, there are connection cables and thus connectors).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the peripheral connector taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 10, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network.

Yeh teaches a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network (Figure 1, Column 7 lines 49 – 52).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the fax modem taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling the PDA to have access to facsimile machines for the sending and receiving of facsimile transmissions as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 11, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device (Column 8 lines 30 – 34).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the keyboard taught by Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to issue commands such as fetching a file from a floppy disk and writing a file onto a floppy disk as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 15, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 8. Yeh further teaches at least one flash card connector for at least one flash card, the flash card containing a driver for the at least one peripheral, the driver being suitable for a particular mobile computing device (Column 4 lines 42 – 47), wherein docking station software allows the mobile computing device to store the driver in the memory of the mobile computing device to communicate with the at least one peripheral while the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 63 – 67, Column 8 lines 1 – 11, the PDA has access to the peripheral ports thus there is inherent driver software in said PDA that enables said PDA to have access to said peripheral ports).

Regarding Claim 17, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Yeh teaches wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, the CPU software enables said CPU to receive the protocol instructions from the PDA)

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the automatic activation of the docking station software method taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling said docking station to be configured to allow said PDA to conduct file transfers as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 18, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 17. Yeh further teaches wherein the docking station sends a unique identifying signal to the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to be detected and a connection with the docking station to be established there must be initial handshaking, said handshaking transmission and recognition of identifying signals) and, wherein the docking station software enables the mobile computing device to recognize the docking station by detecting and recognizing the unique identifying signal (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to start sending protocol instructions to the CPU of the docking station said PDA

there must be initial handshaking between said PDA and said CPU, said handshaking comprises recognition of identifying signals).

Regarding Claim 19, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 8. Yeh further teaches wherein the at least one peripheral device is a printer and, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on the printer (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Regarding Claim 20, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo does not teach a printer, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on a printer.

Yeh teaches a printer, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on a printer (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer and the printing of data taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 26, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach a printer for printing data stored on the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches a printer for printing data stored on the mobile computing device (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 28, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device for control of the at least one peripheral device and for data exchange between the peripheral device and the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device for control of the at least one peripheral device and for data exchange between the peripheral device and the mobile computing device (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39, there are connection cables and thus connectors).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the peripheral connector taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 30, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network.

Yeh teaches a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network (Figure 1, Column 7 lines 49 – 52).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the fax modem taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling the PDA to have access to facsimile machines for the sending and receiving of facsimile transmissions as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 31, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device (Column 8 lines 30 – 34).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the keyboard taught by Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to issue commands such as fetching a file from a floppy disk and writing a file onto a floppy disk as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 35, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 28. Yeh further teaches at least one flash card connector for at least one flash card, the flash card containing a driver for the at least one peripheral, the driver being suitable for a particular mobile computing device (Column 4 lines 42 – 47), wherein docking station software allows the mobile computing device to store the driver in the memory of the mobile computing device to communicate with the at least one peripheral while the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 63 – 67, Column 8 lines 1 – 11, the PDA has access to the peripheral ports thus there is inherent driver software in said PDA that enables said PDA to have access to said peripheral ports).

Regarding Claim 37, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Yeh teaches wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, the CPU software enables said CPU to receive the protocol instructions from the PDA)

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the automatic activation of the docking station software method taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling said docking station to be configured to allow said PDA to conduct file transfers as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 38, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 37. Yeh further teaches wherein the docking station sends a unique identifying signal to the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to be detected and a connection with the docking station to be established there must be initial handshaking, said handshaking transmission and recognition of identifying signals) and, wherein the docking station software enables the mobile computing device to recognize the docking station by detecting and recognizing the unique identifying signal (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to start sending protocol instructions to the CPU of the docking station said PDA there must be initial handshaking between said PDA and said CPU, said handshaking comprises recognition of identifying signals).

Regarding Claim 39, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 28. Yeh further teaches wherein the at least one peripheral device is a printer and, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on the printer (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Regarding Claim 40, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo does not teach a printer, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on a printer.

Yeh teaches a printer, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on a printer (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer and the printing of data taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 64, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach a printer for printing data stored on the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches a printer for printing data stored on the mobile computing device (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 66, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device for control of the at least one peripheral device and for data exchange between the peripheral device and the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device for control of the at least one peripheral device and for data exchange between the peripheral device and the mobile computing device (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39, there are connection cables and thus connectors).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the peripheral connector taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 68, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network.

Yeh teaches a fax modem, the fax modem enabling the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network (Figure 1, Column 7 lines 49 – 52).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the fax modem taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling the PDA to have access to facsimile machines for the sending and receiving of facsimile transmissions as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 69, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device.

Yeh teaches a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device (Column 8 lines 30 – 34).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the keyboard taught by Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to issue commands such as fetching a file from a floppy disk and writing a file onto a floppy disk as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 73, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 66. Yeh further teaches at least one flash card connector for at least one flash card, the flash card containing a driver for the at least one peripheral, the driver being suitable for a particular mobile computing device (Column 4 lines 42 – 47), wherein docking station software allows the mobile computing device to store the driver in the memory of the mobile computing device to communicate with the at least one peripheral while the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 63 – 67, Column 8 lines 1 – 11, the PDA has access to the peripheral ports thus there is inherent driver software in said PDA that enables said PDA to have access to said peripheral ports).

Regarding Claim 75, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo does not teach wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Yeh teaches wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, the CPU software enables said CPU to receive the protocol instructions from the PDA)

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the automatic activation of the docking station software method taught in Yeh in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling said docking station to be configured to allow said PDA to conduct file transfers as taught by Yeh.

Regarding Claim 76, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 75. Yeh further teaches wherein the docking station sends a unique identifying signal to the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to be detected and a connection with the docking station to be established there must be initial handshaking, said handshaking transmission and recognition of identifying signals) and, wherein the docking station software enables the mobile computing device to recognize the docking station by detecting and recognizing the unique identifying signal (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to start sending protocol instructions to the CPU of the docking station said PDA

there must be initial handshaking between said PDA and said CPU, said handshaking comprises recognition of identifying signals).

Regarding Claim 77, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 66. Yeh further teaches wherein the at least one peripheral device is a printer and, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on the printer (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

11. Claims 7, 27, and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954).

Regarding Claim 7, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Pardo further teaches a telephone being capable of functioning as a standalone telephone when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo does not teach a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of functioning as a standalone answering machine when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Pflaum teaches a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on a computing device (Column 4 lines 35 – 43).

Pardo (Column 6 lines 31 – 36) and Pflaum both teach a telephonic device that transfers voice data to a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the digital answering machine taught in Pflaum in the telephone docking station of Pardo for the purpose of creating a standalone combined telephone/digital answering machine for receiving and storing voice and fax data as taught by Pflaum.

Regarding Claim 27, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 21. Pardo further teaches a telephone being capable of functioning as a standalone telephone when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo does not teach a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of functioning as a standalone answering machine when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Pflaum teaches a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on a computing device (Column 4 lines 35 – 43).

Pardo (Column 6 lines 31 – 36) and Pflaum both teach a telephonic device that transfers voice data to a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the digital answering machine taught in Pflaum in the telephone docking station of Pardo for the purpose of

creating a standalone combined telephone/digital answering machine for receiving and storing voice and fax data as taught by Pflaum.

Regarding Claim 65, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 59. Pardo further teaches a telephone being capable of functioning as a standalone telephone when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo does not teach a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of functioning as a standalone answering machine when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Pflaum teaches a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on a computing device (Column 4 lines 35 – 43).

Pardo (Column 6 lines 31 – 36) and Pflaum both teach a telephonic device that transfers voice data to a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the digital answering machine taught in Pflaum in the telephone docking station of Pardo for the purpose of creating a standalone combined telephone/digital answering machine for receiving and storing voice and fax data as taught by Pflaum.

12. Claims 12, 32, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) as applied to Claims 11, 31, 69 above, and further in view of Kuo (US 6,760,773).

Regarding Claim 12, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 11. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard interfaces with the docking station via an infrared transceiver.

Kuo teaches wherein the keyboard interfaces via an infrared transceiver (Column 2 lines 9 – 12).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Kuo teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the keyboard with infrared transceiver taught by Kuo in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling the user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Kuo.

Regarding Claim 32, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 31. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard interfaces with the docking station via an infrared transceiver.

Kuo teaches wherein the keyboard interfaces via an infrared transceiver (Column 2 lines 9 – 12).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Kuo teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the keyboard with infrared

transceiver taught by Kuo in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling the user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Kuo.

Regarding Claim 70, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 69. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard interfaces with the docking station via an infrared transceiver.

Kuo teaches wherein the keyboard interfaces via an infrared transceiver (Column 2 lines 9 – 12).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Kuo teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the keyboard with infrared transceiver taught by Kuo in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling the user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Kuo.

13. Claims 13, 33, and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) as applied to Claims 11, 31, 69 above, and further in view of Schneider et al. (US 6,507,763).

Regarding Claim 13, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 11. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing with the docking station via electromagnetic waves.

Schneider teaches wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing via electromagnetic waves (Column 4 lines 49 – 52, RF signals comprise electromagnetic waves).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Schneider teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the RF keyboard taught by Schneider in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling a user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Schneider.

Regarding Claim 33, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 31. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing with the docking station via electromagnetic waves.

Schneider teaches wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing via electromagnetic waves (Column 4 lines 49 – 52, RF signals comprise electromagnetic waves).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Schneider teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the RF keyboard taught by Schneider in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling a user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Schneider.

Regarding Claim 71, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 69. Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing with the docking station via electromagnetic waves.

Schneider teaches wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing via electromagnetic waves (Column 4 lines 49 – 52, RF signals comprise electromagnetic waves).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Schneider teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the RF keyboard taught by Schneider in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling a user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Schneider.

14. Claims 14, 34, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Henrie et al. (US 6,519,144).

Regarding Claim 14, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 9. Pardo does not teach wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem.

Henrie teaches wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem (Column 8 lines 26 – 28, Column 9 lines 15 – 21).

Pardo and Henrie both teach a docking station for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the high bandwidth modem taught in Henrie in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose

of enabling a faster connection to the internet for the downloading of e- mail or web – clippings as taught by Henrie.

Regarding Claim 34, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 29. Pardo does not teach wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem.

Henrie teaches wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem (Column 8 lines 26 – 28, Column 9 lines 15 – 21).

Pardo and Henrie both teach a docking station for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the high bandwidth modem taught in Henrie in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a faster connection to the internet for the downloading of e- mail or web – clippings as taught by Henrie.

Regarding Claim 72, Pardo teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 67. Pardo does not teach wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem.

Henrie teaches wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem (Column 8 lines 26 – 28, Column 9 lines 15 – 21).

Pardo and Henrie both teach a docking station for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the high bandwidth modem taught in Henrie in the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a faster connection to the internet for the downloading of e- mail or web – clippings as taught by Henrie.

15. Claims 16, 36, and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) as applied to Claim 15, 35, and 73 above, and further in view of Katsch (US 6,697,884).

Regarding Claim 16, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 15. Pardo further teaches wherein the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the docking station software allows the mobile computing device to automatically delete the at least one driver from the memory of the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station.

Katsch teaches a computing device automatically deleting the at least one driver from the memory of said computing device (Column 9 lines 22 – 23).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Katsch teach a computing device with driver software thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the driver software deletion method taught by Katsch in the PDA of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling more efficient use of memory space as taught by Katsch.

Regarding Claim 36, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 35. Pardo further teaches wherein the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the docking station software allows the mobile computing device to automatically delete the at least one driver from the

memory of the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station.

Katsch teaches a computing device automatically deleting the at least one driver from the memory of said computing device (Column 9 lines 22 – 23).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Katsch teach a computing device with driver software thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the driver software deletion method taught by Katsch in the PDA of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling more efficient use of memory space as taught by Katsch.

Regarding Claim 74, Pardo in view of Yeh teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 73. Pardo further teaches wherein the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach wherein the docking station software allows the mobile computing device to automatically delete the at least one driver from the memory of the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station.

Katsch teaches a computing device automatically deleting the at least one driver from the memory of said computing device (Column 9 lines 22 – 23).

Pardo in view of Yeh and Katsch teach a computing device with driver software thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the driver software deletion method taught by Katsch in the

PDA of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling more efficient use of memory space as taught by Katsch.

16. Claims 41, 46 – 50, 54, and 56 – 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) and in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954).

Regarding Claim 41, Pardo teaches a docking station for a mobile computing device, the mobile computing device having a rechargeable battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28), comprising: a base (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 19 – 23, the telephone docking station is the base); a holder for docking the mobile computing device in the docking station, the holder providing an electrical connection between the mobile computing device and the docking station (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 20 – 23, the holder is the port (16) for the personal digital assistant (PDA)); a charger for recharging the rechargeable battery (Column 7 lines 26 – 28); a telephone, the telephone being capable of directly dialing a number stored in a database on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is connected to the docking station (Column 6 lines 31 – 32), the telephone being capable of dialing a number through operation of the telephone keypad when the mobile computing device is not docked (Figure 3A, Column 7 lines 9 – 11); a modem, wherein the base, the holder, the charger, the telephone and the modem are integral to the docking station (Figure 1, Column 5 lines 19 – 23, Column 5 lines 52 – 56, Column 7 lines 26 - 28).

Pardo does not teach a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of functioning as a standalone answering machine when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station and a printer.

Yeh teaches a printer (Column 6 lines 34 – 35).

Pardo and Yeh both teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the printer taught in Yeh with the docking station of Pardo for the purpose of enabling a user of said PDA to print a desired file as taught by Yeh.

Pardo further teaches a telephone being capable of functioning as a standalone telephone when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo in view of Yeh does not teach a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of functioning as a standalone answering machine when the mobile computing device is not docked in the docking station, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station.

Pflaum teaches a digital answering machine, the digital answering machine being capable of storing messages on a computing device (Column 4 lines 35 – 43).

Pardo (Column 6 lines 31 – 36) in view of Yeh and Pflaum teach a telephonic device that transfers voice data to a computing device thus it would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the digital answering machine taught in Pflaum in the telephone docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of creating a standalone combined telephone/digital answering machine for receiving and storing voice and fax data as taught by Pflaum.

Regarding Claim 46, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Yeh further teaches a printer for printing data stored on the mobile computing device or the docking station (Figure 1, Column 6 lines 23 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

Regarding Claim 47, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Yeh further teaches at least one peripheral connector for electrically connecting at least one peripheral device to the docking station, the at least one peripheral connector allowing communication between the mobile computing device and the at least one peripheral device (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39, there are connection cables and thus connectors).

Regarding Claim 48, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Pardo further teaches wherein the modem enables the mobile computing device to access the Internet (Column 5 lines 52 – 56).

Regarding Claim 49, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Yeh further teaches wherein the modem enables the mobile computing device to fax data to a receiver over a public switched telephone network (Figure 1, Column 7 lines 49 – 52).

Regarding Claim 50, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Yeh further teaches a keyboard for quick and easy entry of data to the mobile computing device (Column 8 lines 30 – 34).

Regarding Claim 54, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 47. Yeh further teaches at least one flash card connector for at least one flash card, the flash card containing a driver for the at least one peripheral, the driver being suitable for a particular mobile computing device (Column 4 lines 42 – 47), wherein docking station software allows the mobile computing device to store the driver in the memory of the mobile computing device to communicate with the at least one peripheral while the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 7 lines 63 – 67, Column 8 lines 1 – 11, the PDA has access to the peripheral ports thus there is inherent driver software in said PDA that enables said PDA to have access to said peripheral ports).

Regarding Claim 56, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Yeh further teaches wherein docking station software is automatically activated whenever the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, the CPU software enables said CPU to receive the protocol instructions from the PDA).

Regarding Claim 57, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 56. Yeh further teaches wherein the docking station sends a unique identifying signal to the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is docked in the docking station (Column 8 lines 3 – 11,

Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to be detected and a connection with the docking station to be established there must be initial handshaking, said handshaking transmission and recognition of identifying signals) and, wherein the docking station software enables the mobile computing device to recognize the docking station by detecting and recognizing the unique identifying signal (Column 8 lines 3 – 11, Column 8 lines 30 – 34, in order for the PDA to start sending protocol instructions to the CPU of the docking station said PDA there must be initial handshaking between said PDA and said CPU, said handshaking comprises recognition of identifying signals).

Regarding Claim 58, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 47. Yeh further teaches wherein the at least one peripheral device is a printer and, wherein data stored or received by the mobile computing device or the docking station may be printed on the printer (Column 6 lines 31 – 35, Column 8 lines 36 – 39).

17. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claim 41 above, and further in view of Helot (US 6,231,371).
Regarding Claim 42, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station.

Helot teaches wherein the holder is electrically connected to a hinge pin, the hinge pin allowing the holder to rotate about an axis of the hinge pin, the hinge pin forming an electrical interface to the docking station (Column 2 lines 59 – 65, Column 5 lines 33 – 39, the cradle can be rotated such that the user can view the PDA at different angles, said cradle is electrically connected to the docking station thus there is an inherent hinge pin).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Helot teach a docking station with a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the hinge pin taught in Helot in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of creating an adjustable cradle that will allow a docked PDA to be viewed at an optimal angle reduce glare and to maximize contrast on the display of said PDA as taught by Helot.

18. Claims 43 – 45 and 61, 78, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claims 41 and 49 above, and further in view of Kennedy et al. (US 6,377,825).

Regarding Claim 43, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the holder is a detachable holder.

Kennedy teaches a holder that is a detachable holder (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 – 65, the pocket is the holder, a plurality of pockets can used with the same interface module which means that said pocket is detachable).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Kennedy (Column 5 lines 25 – 30) teach a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the detachable pocket taught in Kennedy in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of enabling a user to use a plurality of PDA models without having to replace said docking station as taught by Kennedy.

Regarding Claim 44, Pardo in view of Yeh in further view of Pflaum and in further view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 43. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder is interchangeable with at least one other detachable holder for at least one other mobile computing device of a different form and type (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30).

Regarding Claim 45, Pardo in view of Yeh in further view of Pflaum and in further view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 44. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder and the at least one other detachable holder includes an outside portion and an inside portion (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 - 65, the outside portion of the pocket connects to the interface module (106)), the outside portion providing an electrical connection to an electrical interface (Column 6 lines 11 – 19), the inside portion providing an electrical connection to a unique electrical interface of the mobile computing device and at least one other mobile computing

device, respectively (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30, Column 6 lines 1 – 5).

Regarding Claim 61, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 49. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the holder is a detachable holder.

Kennedy teaches a holder that is a detachable holder (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 – 65, the pocket is the holder, a plurality of pockets can used with the same interface module which means that said pocket is detachable).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Kennedy (Column 5 lines 25 – 30) teach a holder for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the detachable pocket taught in Kennedy in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of enabling a user to use a plurality of PDA models without having to replace said docking station as taught by Kennedy.

Regarding Claim 78, Pardo in view of Yeh in further view of Pflaum and in further view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 61. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder is interchangeable with at least one other detachable holder for at least one other mobile computing device of a different form or type (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30).

Regarding Claim 79, Pardo in view of Yeh in further view of Pflaum and in further view of Kennedy teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 78. Kennedy further teaches wherein the detachable holder and the at least one other detachable

holder includes an outside portion and an inside portion (Figure 1A, Column 3 lines 52 - 65, the outside portion of the pocket connects to the interface module (106)), the outside portion providing an electrical connection to an electrical interface (Column 6 lines 11 – 19), the inside portion providing an electrical connection to a unique electrical interface of the mobile computing device and at least one other mobile computing device, respectively (Column 3 lines 52 – 65, Column 5 lines 25 – 30, Column 6 lines 1 – 5).

19. Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claim 41 above, and further in view of Kuo (US 6,760,773).

Regarding Claim 51, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not wherein the keyboard interfaces with the docking station via an infrared transceiver.

Kuo teaches wherein the keyboard interfaces via an infrared transceiver (Column 2 lines 9 – 12).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Kuo teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the keyboard with infrared transceiver taught by Kuo in the docking station of

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of enabling the user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Kuo.

20. Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claim 41 above, and further in view of Schneider et al. (US 6,507,763).

Regarding Claim 52, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 41. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing with the docking station via electromagnetic waves.

Schneider teaches wherein the keyboard is wireless, the keyboard interfacing via electromagnetic waves (Column 4 lines 49 – 52, RF signals comprise electromagnetic waves).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Schneider teach a keyboard that interfaces with a computing device thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make a design preference and use the RF keyboard taught by Schneider in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of enabling a user to communicate wirelessly with said computing device as taught by Schneider.

21. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claim 48 above, and further in view of Henrie et al. (US 6,519,144).

Regarding Claim 53, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 48. Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem.

Henrie teaches wherein the data modem is a high bandwidth data modem (Column 8 lines 26 – 28, Column 9 lines 15 – 21).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Henrie teach a docking station for a PDA thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the high bandwidth modem taught in Henrie in the docking station of Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum for the purpose of enabling a faster connection to the internet for the downloading of e- mail or web – clippings as taught by Henrie.

22. Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo (US 6,266,539) in view of Yeh (5,666,495) in further view of Pflaum (US 6,700,954) as applied to Claim 54 above, and further in view of Katsch (US 6,697,884).

Regarding Claim 55, Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 55. Pardo further teaches wherein the

mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station (Column 7 lines 9 – 11).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum does not teach wherein the docking station software allows the mobile computing device to automatically delete the at least one driver from the memory of the mobile computing device when the mobile computing device is disconnected from the docking station.

Katsch teaches a computing device automatically deleting the at least one driver from the memory of said computing device (Column 9 lines 22 – 23).

Pardo in view of Yeh and in further view of Pflaum and Katsch teach a computing device with driver software thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the driver software deletion method taught by Katsch in the PDA of Pardo in view of Yeh for the purpose of enabling more efficient use of memory space as taught by Katsch.

Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond S Dean whose telephone number is 703-305-8998. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Raymond S. Dean
July 27, 2004

NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER